



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In the notes to Major Brooks's Report there is a deal of miscellaneous information, to which we can allude no further than to say that it relates to the subjects of Palisading, Wire Entanglement, Booms, Barri-cades, Torpedoes, Engineer Depots, Siege Material, Platforms, Sapping, &c.

There is other matter in the book instructive and interesting, both for professional men and amateurs, but space does not suffice for more particular mention of it. The correspondence between General Beauregard and General Gillmore, and that between Admiral Dahlgren and the latter, and a statement of R. P. Parrott in defence of his guns, conclude the volume.

Besides the numerous well-executed plates which are scattered through the book, there are some very excellent charts and maps. The book is thoroughly satisfactory. Paper and print are good; the proofs have been well read; the text is well written, almost without exception. It should find a place in the library of scientific soldiers everywhere, and in the library of every American, whether he make a study of military matters or no. For mere practical value, as a book of consultation and reference, it seems as if it must be beyond price for all casters of heavy cannon.

7.—*Southern Slavery in its Present Aspects: containing a Reply to a late Work of the Bishop of Vermont on Slavery.* By DANIEL R. GOODWIN. Philadelphia. 1864. 12mo. pp. 393.

As a reply to Bishop Hopkins, this is a work of supererogation, admirably executed. The world has already heard more of the Bishop's efforts to justify Southern slavery and Southern rebellion than those efforts deserve. His infirmity of temper, superficiality of information, and deficiency of reasoning power, render him peculiarly unfit to grapple with the details of a subject involving the history of man in his religious, social, and political relations. His feeble attempts, therefore, to stem the mighty current of public opinion, would have met the silent indifference which they merit, had not a corrupt faction required the aid of one whose position seemed to command attention and respect. Finding in him the tool which they required, politicians succeeded in elevating his essays into the bad eminence of temporary notoriety. Used as political "campaign documents" by one party, they were necessarily combated by similar documents on the other side. They failed in their mission, and may safely be left to the obscurity into which, by a natural law, they have so speedily fallen.

Admitting, however, that it was worth while to dissect Bishop Hop-

kins, the autopsy could not have been intrusted to abler hands than those of the distinguished Provost of the University of Pennsylvania. The defects of temper, the fallacies of argument, the *suggestio falsi*, the *suppressio veri*, are successively developed with a trenchant logic that leaves little to be desired. Had not the Bishop, indeed, placed himself without the pale of human sympathy, it would be difficult to repress a feeling of pity at the helplessness of his overthrow. The disparity between the disputants is so great, that it seems like a grown man wrestling with a child; and at every throw of the weaker party, one is tempted to ask his antagonist, in school-boy parlance, "Why don't you take one of your size?"

Dr. Goodwin commences by reviewing the controversy between the clergy of Pennsylvania and the Bishop,—or rather by showing that there has been no "controversy," where one party simply repudiated all complicity with odious theories disseminated by the other. He points out the groundlessness of the complaints so loudly reiterated by the right reverend assailant, and characterizes in fitting terms the bad temper and worse logic with which he has endeavored to extricate himself from his false position.

Dr. Hopkins's "Bible View of Slavery" then comes under review. After satisfactorily disposing of it, Dr. Goodwin takes up the Bishop's more ambitious performance, the "Scriptural, Ecclesiastical, and Historical View of Slavery." If any of our readers have been so unfortunate as to wade through that dullest of dull performances, they will remember that its leading characteristic is shallow sophistry, enlivened occasionally by smart special pleading. These peculiarities receive full justice at the hands of Dr. Goodwin.

In one respect, indeed, he might have been much more severe than he has seen fit to be. Whether from ignorance or from obliquity, the historical portions of the Bishop's labors are singularly incorrect. In some instances, we are tempted to assign blunders or misstatements to the former, for the work is evidently the result of *cramming* for the occasion; in others, the latter is evidently the cause of error, for the Bishop has had within reach the means of ascertaining the truth, but has chosen to suppress a part of the facts before him. Much of this Dr. Goodwin charitably passes over. Thus (p. 201) the Bishop has the incredible audacity to assert that, in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, "although Massachusetts had abolished slavery, yet her *delegation*, along with that of the other Eastern States, insisted on continuing the slave-trade for twenty years more, against the wishes of Virginia,"—when he must or ought to have known that the permission to carry on that infernal traffic was the price which the extreme Southern

States set on their assent to entering the Union, and that they coerced their Eastern sisters, as they have so often done since, into a compromise with them. As Mr. Rutledge, of South Carolina, defiantly declared, "If the Convention thinks that North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia will ever agree to the plan, unless their right to import slaves be untouched, the expectation is vain. The people of those States will never be such fools as to give up so important an interest." And Mr. Madison, in the ratifying Convention of Virginia, expressly asserted, "The Southern States would not have entered into the Union of America without the *temporary* permission of that trade." The debates in the Massachusetts Convention show that this temporary permission was a great objection to the adoption of the Constitution in New England, and that it was only overcome by the argument that under the Constitution the trade might be stopped in twenty years, while without the Constitution it might be continued indefinitely. Yet Bishop Hopkins ignorantly or maliciously endeavors to fasten upon New England the sole responsibility of that great wrong in which she reluctantly acquiesced at the bidding of imperious South Carolina.

The same effort at a *suggestio falsi* by a *suppressio veri* is to be found in the Bishop's account of the Council of London in 1102 (not 1011 as he persistently asserts), which adopted a canon forbidding the sale of men like cattle.* Bishop Wilberforce had alluded to this as a rule of the Church which should be observed in America, and Bishop Hopkins makes a great parade of his success in demolishing the authority of the canon: — "I took the pains to look into the real state of the matter, and discovered that the statement was founded upon a mistake." This "mistake" lies in the fact that Archbishop Anselm, who presided over the Council, shortly afterwards wrote an epistle to Archdeacon William giving him certain instructions as to enforcing its decrees. In this, he says that the canons were hastily adopted, and that some changes were requisite in them. As his instructions do not cover the one forbidding the sale of men, Bishop Hopkins boldly styles the canon "imaginary," and says, "Hence this supposed decree of the Council of London really amounts to nothing."

Now Bishop Hopkins, knowing this much, must also have known that this "supposed" "imaginary" canon rests on the authority of Archbishop Anselm himself. Our only account of the Council is derived from the contemporary Eadmer, in his *Historia Novorum*. He does not give us the full canons, but only a summary or series of

* "Ne quis illud nefarium negotium, quo hactenus homines in Anglia solebant velut bruta animalia venundari, deinceps ullatenus facere præsumat." — Concil. London., ann. 1102, can. xxviii.

rubrics, and these he expressly quotes from Anselm.* The letter to Archdeacon William, moreover, is exceedingly short, and alludes to but five out of the thirty canons adopted by the Council. Are we therefore to conclude that Anselm, as quoted by Eadmer, amused himself with manufacturing the other five and twenty "imaginary" and "supposititious" canons?

It would be a wearisome and unprofitable task to recount and expose the blunders and misstatements of Bishop Hopkins, and we do not wonder that Mr. Goodwin has charitably passed many of them by. Had he, indeed, confined himself to a review of the Vermont prelate, his book would have been, as we suggested above, a work of supererogation. Fortunately he has not done so. In his later chapters he takes a wider range, and considers slavery in its political and social relations, with a clearness of thought and precision of reasoning which impart a permanent value to his book. These chapters are well worthy the study of every one who is called to take part, as all citizens of the Republic must, in the settlement of the momentous questions which, within the next few years, will decide the fate of the country. His vigorous intellect penetrates to the heart of issues which have been complicated by the declamatory artifices of innumerable politicians; and in a few terse sentences he disentangles them from the shams in which they have been so industriously concealed. Nowhere, for instance, have we seen so clear and condensed a presentation of the status of the revolted States, or of our rights and duties with respect to them, as the following:—

"In short, then, secession took no State out of the Union, either as a territory or as a people; but, as a political organization, it did take every seceded State out of the Union,—that is to say, it left the State no organization in the Union, and the organization it has substituted is out of the Union; is, *de jure*, spurious, illegitimate, unconstitutional, null; and *de facto*, hostile and rebellious. Neither the national Constitution nor national self-respect will allow the United States government to recognize, or in any manner to treat with, such treasonable organizations. Such a recognition would itself be an acknowledgment of the dissolution of the Union. The rebellious States are all constitutionally and legally in the Union; but, in order to re-

* Eadmer, Hist. Novor., Lib. iii. p. 67, seqq., ap. Wilkins, Conc. Britan. I. 382. "*Cujus concilii seriem, sicut ab eodem patre Anselmo descripta est, huic operi inserere non incongruum existavimus. Scribit itaque sic.*" Then follows the summary of thirty canons. Anselm might well shrink from essaying to enforce a canon which would bring him into conflict with the whole feudal power of the realm. Even as a mere expression of opinion, we may wonder at the boldness of the Council in adopting it. We have seen in our own day how prompt are slave-mongers to resent any such manifestations of the freedom of thought and of speech.

sume their *political functions* as members of the Union, they must be *organized de novo*. In this sense, and so far, they must be treated as 'Territories.' This reorganization must be based upon some enabling act or some legitimating authority proceeding from the government of the United States. And such enabling act or legitimating authority cannot, without absurdity, be forbidden to apply such conditions, restrictions, and modes of procedure in the process of reorganization, as the Rebellion itself has demonstrated to be absolutely necessary to the national existence, the national Union, and national peace."—pp. 334, 335.

In conclusion, we cannot but regret that Mr. Goodwin had not at the start thrown off all reference to Bishop Hopkins, and given us an independent work upon a subject which he has shown himself so well qualified to treat. Vast masses of our people still require education on the vital questions connected with slavery, and many thinking men, who would be benefited by the sturdy and impervious logic of our author, will be deterred from taking up his volume on account of the controversial aspect arising from his demolition of the thrice-routed Bishop of Vermont.

-
8. — *The Life and Times of Sir William Johnson, Bart.* By WILLIAM L. STONE. Albany: J. Munsell. 1865. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. xv. and 555, 544.

THIS work was planned and the first seven chapters of it were written by the late Colonel William L. Stone, sometime editor of the New York Commercial Advertiser, and favorably known as the author of a *Life of Joseph Brant*, a *History of Wyoming*, and some other works in the department of Indian biography. At his death, in 1844, his manuscripts passed into the possession of his son of the same name, together with the copious materials which, with much difficulty and expense, he had collected for his long meditated *Life of Johnson*, and which comprised upward of five thousand unpublished letters. The portion of the work for which we are indebted to Colonel Stone fills about half of the first volume; and the residue, if we may judge from the internal evidence afforded by a comparison of the two parts, has been executed in strict accordance with the original plan. The style of the son is very much like that of the father; their views of the character of Sir William Johnson and of the time in which he lived seem to be identical; and the same characteristics of plan and execution are apparent in one part which we notice in the other.

Failing to recognize the broad distinction between history and biography, the authors have given us a history of the times of Sir William